215.406-3

215.406-3 Documenting the negotia-

(a)(7) Include the principal factors related to the disposition of findings and recommendation contained in preaward and postaward contract audit and other advisory reports.

(10) The documentation—

(A) Must address significant deviations from the prenegotiation profit objective;

(B) Should include the DD Form 1547, Record of Weighted Guidelines Application (see 215.404–70), if used, with supporting rationale; and

(C) Must address the rationale for not using the weighted guidelines method when its use would otherwise be required by 215.404–70.

215.407-2 Make-or-buy programs.

(e) Program requirements—(1) Items and work included. The minimum dollar amount is \$1 million.

215.407-3 Forward pricing rate agreements.

(b)(i) Use forward pricing rate agreement (FPRA) rates when such rates are available, unless waived on a case-by-case basis by the head of the contracting activity.

(ii) Advise the ACO of each case waived.

(iii) Contact the ACO for questions on FPRAs or recommended rates.

215.407-4 Should-cost review.

(b) Program should-cost review. (2) DoD contracting activities should consider performing a program should-cost review before award of a definitive contract for a major system as defined by DoDI 5000.2. See DoDI 5000.2 regarding industry participation.

(c) Overhead should-cost review. (1) Contact the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) (http://www.dcmc.hq.dla.mil/) for questions on overhead should-cost analysis.

(2)(A) DCMA or the military department responsible for performing contact administration functions (e.g., Navy SUPSHIP) should consider, based on risk assessment, performing an overhead should-cost review of a contractor business unit (as defined in FAR 2.101) when all of the following conditions exist:

- (1) Projected annual sales to DoD exceed \$1 billion:
- (2) Projected DoD versus total business exceeds 30 percent;
- (3) Level of sole source DoD contracts is high;
- (4) Significant volume of proposal activity is anticipated;
- (5) Production or development of a major weapon system or program is anticipated; and
- (6) Contractor cost control/reduction initiatives appear inadequate.
- (B) The head of the contracting activity may request an overhead should-cost review for a business unit that does not meet the criteria in paragraph (c)(2)(A) of this subsection.
- (C) Overhead should-cost reviews are labor intensive. These reviews generally involve participation by the contracting, contract administration, and contract audit elements. The extent of availability of military department, contract administration, and contract audit resources to support DCMA-led teams should be considered when determining whether a review will be conducted. Overhead should-cost reviews generally shall not be conducted at a contractor business segment more frequently than every 3 years.

[63 FR 55040, Oct. 14, 1998, as amended at 65 FR 52952, Aug. 31, 2000; 65 FR 58607, Sept. 29, 2000; 67 FR 49252, 49255, July 30, 2002]

215.407-5 Estimating systems.

215.407-5-70 Disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements.

- (a) Definitions. (1) $Acceptable\ estimating\ system\ means\ an\ estimating\ system\ that—$
- (i) Is established, maintained, reliable, and consistently applied; and
- (ii) Produces verifiable, supportable, and documented cost estimates.
- (2) Contractor means a business unit as defined in FAR 2.101.
- (3) *Estimating system* is as defined in the clause at 252.215-7002, Cost Estimating System Requirements.
- (4) Significant estimating system deficiency means a shortcoming in the estimating system that is likely to consistently result in proposal estimates